

REMARKS

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-3, 17-19, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker et al. (U.S. Patent 5,930,368, hereinafter “Hocker”) in view of Elliott et al. (US Pub. 2004/0184615, hereinafter “Elliott”). Claims 10, 13-14, 16, 20 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker in view of Elliott and Tom’s Hardware. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker in view of Elliott as applied to claim 17 and further in view of Scott et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,596, hereinafter “Scott”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 13 was rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 13 has been amended in view of the Examiner’s constructive comments. As amended, it is believed that claim 13 is in condition to overcome the noted rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

1. Claims 1-3, 17-19, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker in view of Elliott.

The cited Elliott reference is directed to a cryptographic key distribution system. In FIG. 1 an exemplary network 100 includes local area networks 120 and 125 each connecting a plurality of host computers (130a-c and 135a-c). The LANs 120 and 125 are coupled to each other via a first network 110 such as the public switch telephone network (PSTN) and an optical link network 115 used for key distribution. Applicants agree with the Examiner’s comments found in page 4 that states that the Elliott reference does not expressly teach that the light-based communication connection does not ensure a defined positional relationship.

The cited Hocker reference is directed to a docking method for establishing secure communications between a first device (a wireless mouse 10) and a second device (PC 14). When the wireless mouse is docked with the PC, address information is exchanged between the two devices and the secure communications between the two devices can commence.

It was stated in the office action with regard to claim 1 that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Hocker teaching with the Elliot light based communication connection. Applicants respectfully disagree. One of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings given that in Hocker, the light based communication is only operable within an extremely short range, see for example the discussion in FIG. 2 wherein the mouse can operate with a first computer while in docking area 32 and with a second computer when in docking area 32', even when both of the computers are very close to each other. The short range design discussed in Hocker is completely useless in Elliot which is dealing with a network 100 which is geographically disbursed as compared to Hocker given that the first network 110 is for example a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN), a metropolitan area network or the like. Since the first network 110 covers a fairly large distance, makes the second (optical link) network 115 need to cover substantially the same amount of distance. The optical link network 115 as mentioned in Elliott can comprise an optical fiber network or the like. As such, the office action has failed to identify a viable reason why a person of ordinary skill would have been led to combine the teachings of the cited art in the manner set forth in Applicants claimed invention.

Although it is believed that the claim 1 is in condition for allowance in view of the above comments, claim 1 has been further modified to recite that the first and second devices are located within a computer in order to further clarify the invention. Support for this amendment can be found for example in the discussion relating to FIG 4. Dependent claims 2-3 and 30 are also believed to be in condition for allowance given that they add further nonobvious features to claim 1.

Independent claim 17 has been amended in similar fashion as claim 1 and is believed to be in condition for allowance given the above comments. Dependent claims 18-20, 23 and 32 which add further nonobvious features to independent claim 17 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

2. Claims 10, 13-14, 16, 20 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker in view of Elliott and Tom's Hardware. Claim 23 was rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocker in view of Elliott as applied to claim 17 and further in view of Scott.

It is believed that these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the comments made above of the improper combination of Hocker and Elliott. Furthermore, with regard to independent claim 10, the combination of Hocker, Elliott and Tom's hardware taken individually or in combination fails to teach or suggest (amendment to the claim shown in bold): *"wherein the second light based communication channel enables transmission of said datum between said first component and said second component only when said second component is plugged into the I/O slot thereby establishing **a fixed and defined positional orientation between the first and second components**"*. There is simply no mention in any of the references of enabling a light based communication channel only when the second component which comprises a plug-in board is plugged into a particular I/O slot which establishes a fixed and defined position orientation between the first and second components, wherein the first component is an electronic device mounted on the computer motherboard. The Tom's hardware reference simply mentions the common computer that includes slots for accepting plug-in boards, while FIG. 6 of Hocker simply shows a docking port 83 for docking the wireless mouse 10 onto the front of the computer display. There is no discussion in these two references or the Elliott reference of transmitting between a plug-in board when it is plugged into a particular I/O slot which causes a fixed and defined positional relationship between the electronic device mounted on the motherboard (first device) and the plug-in board (second device). The plugging of a mouse into a U-shaped dock as taught by Hocker is completely different than that which is claimed in claim 10. Furthermore, the combination of Tom's hardware with Hocker simply adds no suggestion or motivation to add a light based communication link between a plug-in card of Tom's hardware to an electronic device located on the mother board. Not only has the office action failed to establish why one of ordinary skilled in the art would want to combine the cited references, even if it were assumed that the references could be so combined, they still would fail to teach or suggest what is being claimed. Given the above it is believed that independent claim 10 along with dependent claims 13-14, 16 and 31 which add further nonobvious features are believed to be in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: 305777.02 / MSFT-2912
Application No.: 10/759,325
Office Action Dated: April 24, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: July 24, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439